

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Restriction Requirement dated September 3, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive. Claims 1-16 are amended solely to improve clarity. Claims 17-19 and 27-33 are canceled herewith without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 20-26, which previously depended from Claim 17, are amended herewith to improve clarity, and to depend directly, or indirectly, from Claim 1. The specification has also been amended to correct an obvious translation error. Specifically, on page 10, line 20 of the specification as filed, recitation of “device” has been amended to recite “layout.” Due to the similarity between the French words for device and layout, *i.e.*, *dispositif* and *disposition*, respectively, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate such an obvious translational error, and the appropriate correction. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants elect Group I, Claims 1-16 for examination. This election is made with traverse, for the following reasons.

Initially, Applicants note that all the dependent claims as amended depend ultimately from Claim 1. That is, Claims 20-26, which previously depended from Claim 17 (and were categorized within Group II in the Restriction Requirement), now depend from, are further limiting, and incorporate all the limitations of, independent Claim 1. As a result of the foregoing claim amendments, Claims 2-16 and 20-26 further define the invention claimed in Claim 1 and thus all the claims are directed to the same invention. Therefore, Claims 1-16 and 20-26 should

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT AND
PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT
U.S. Application No.: 10/540,516

Attorney Docket No.: Q88805

be examined on the merits in the instant Application, and the Requirement for Restriction withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended clearly possess unity of invention, as being linked by a special technical feature not disclosed in the prior art. Specifically, Applicants point out that Perov *et al.*, cited to support a lack of unity of invention, do not disclose a device for reading and analyzing chips, comprising a temperature-control element using a plurality of Peltier-type heating/cooling elements arranged opposite various spots on the surface of the table which receives the chip to be read, as is recited in instant Claim 1. For this reason also, Applicants maintain that all of Claims 1-16 and 20-26 should be examined on the merits in the instant application.

Applicants reserve the right to file one or more Divisional Applications directed to non-elected subject matter.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Chid S. Iyer
Registration No. 43,355

Date: November 3, 2008